UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/918,204	07/30/2001	Taejae Lee	STL920000096US1	2143

	7590	11/30/2004

David W. Victor
KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR LLP
315 S. Beverly Drive, Suite 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212

EXAMINER
MIRZA, ADNAN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2145	

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 July 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 July 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date *12/26/2001*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Claims 25-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because "An article of manufacture" in

the preamble of claims 25-36 does not equal to a medium. It should be replaced by "A computer

readable medium" in claims 25-36.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graylin et al

(U.S. 2003/0033415 and Rajarajan et al (U.S. 2002/0143949).

As per claims 1,13,25 Graylin disclosed a method for enabling access to resource objects in an

application engine, comprising: receiving a request, from a calling entity, for resource objects of

a specified type in the application engine; generating a request to the application engine for

information on available resource objects of the specified type (Page. 2, Paragraph 0033);

However Graylin did not disclose in detail in response to receiving the information from the

application engine, generating a collection object including one metadata element for each

resource object of the specified type in the application engine; and returning the generated

collection object to the calling entity.

In the same field of endeavor Rajarajan disclosed next the method receives a request to perform

the management task in relation to the first managed object and determines which resource to

call in response to the request; and then sends a task request to the determined resource to

perform the management task (Page. 2, Paragraph 0011). A request is generated and sent to the

identified resource to collect all dynamic task. Dynamic task information relates to functions that

may be performed on particular data object, e.g., a particular user, but may not be available for

all objects of that type, e.g., all users. Additionally, dynamic task may relate to the particular

instance of an object, e.g., a task relating to disabling an account is dynamic since it depends on

whether the account has been enabled (Page. 12, Paragraph. 0101).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

was made to have incorporated next the method receives a request to perform the management

task in relation to the first managed object and determines which resource to call in response to

the request; and then sends a task request to the determined resource to perform the management

task. A request is generated and sent to the identified resource to collect all dynamic task.

Dynamic task information relates to functions that may be performed on particular data object,

e.g., a particular user, but may not be available for all objects of that type, e.g., all users.

Additionally, dynamic task may relate to the particular instance of an object, e.g., a task relating

to disabling an account is dynamic since it depends on whether the account has been enabled as

taught by Rajarajan in the method of Graylin because accessing different resources in this

manner is time consuming and requires a mastery of many types of applications and front –ends

(Page. 1, Paragraph. 0007).

3.   As per claims 2,14,26 Graylin- Rajarajan disclosed wherein the calling entity comprises

an application program (Graylin, Page. 7, Paragraph 0078).

4.   As per claim 3,15,27 Graylin-Rajarajan disclosed wherein the calling entity issues the

request from a client and wherein the request is received on a server including the application

engine (Graylin, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0078).

5.   As per claims 4,16,28 Graylin-Rajarajan disclosed wherein the application engine is one

of a plurality of service engines enabling access to service resources, wherein the request for the

resource objects from the calling entity comprises a method that is a member of a service class

implementation of the application engine, wherein each service engine provides one service class

implementation of methods and objects from a same abstract service class (Rajarajan, Page. 7,

Paragraph 0072-0074).

6.   As per claims 5,17,29 Graylin-Rajarajan disclosed wherein the application engine and

other service 2 engines comprise workflow products from different vendors (Rajarajan, Page. 20,

Paragraph. 0175).

7.   As per claims 6,18,30 Graylin-Rajarajan disclosed wherein the workflow service class

implementations from different vendors each include methods and objects from a same abstract

workflow service class specifying methods and objects to include in all workflow service class

implementations (Graylin, Page. 8, Paragraph 0095).

8.   As per claims 7,19,31 Graylin-Rajarajan disclosed wherein the application engine

comprises a workflow engine and wherein the specified type of the requested resource objects

comprises one of workflow objects, workflow templates and work lists defined in the application

engine (Graylin, Page. 8, Paragraph 0091).

9.   As per claims 8,20,32 Graylin-Rajarajan disclosed wherein the collection object is

generated using methods from a collection object class, further comprising: receiving a retrieve

method in the collection object class from the calling entity requesting the resource object

represented by one selected metadata element in the collection object (Rajarajan, Page. 5,

Paragraph. 0050); generating an additional request to the application engine for the resource

object requested in the retrieve method; receiving the requested resource object from the

application engine; and returning the requested resource object to the calling entity invoking the

retrieve method (Rajarajan , Page. 7, Paragraph. 0072).

10.   As per claims 9,21,33 Graylin-Rajarajan disclosed wherein the calling entity uses

methods from the collection object class to access the collection object (Rajarajan, Page. 12,

Paragraph. 0098).

11.   As per claims 10,22,34 Graylin-Rajarajan disclosed wherein the generated additional

request to the application engine is in a service class implemented by the application engine

including methods and objects to access the application engine (Graylin, Page. 2, Paragraph

0033).

12.   As per claims 11,23,35 Graylin-Rajarajjan disclosed wherein the application engine is

one of a plurality of service engines enabling access to service resources, wherein each service

engine provides one collection object class implementation of methods from a same abstract

collection object class used to instantiate and manipulate a collection object including metadata

on resource objects available at: the application engine (Page. 6, Paragraph 0061-0062).

13.   As per claim 12,24,36 Graylin-Rajarajjan disclosed wherein the collection object is

generated using methods from a collection object class and wherein the request for the resource

object from the calling entity is in a service class implemented by the application engine that

includes methods and objects to access the application engine (Page. 5, Paragraph. 0049-0050).

Conclusion

14.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner

should be directed to Adnan Mirza whose telephone number is (571)-272-3885.

15.   The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday during normal business

hours.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Dharia Rupal can be reached on (571)-272-3880. The fax for this group is (703)-746-

7239.

16.   The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned are as follows:

(703)-746-7239 (For Status Inquiries, Informal or Draft Communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT");

(703)-746-7239 (For Official Communications Intended for entry, please mark "EXPEDITED

PROCEDURE"),

(703)-746-7238 (For After Final Communications).

17.   Any Inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)-305-3900.

Any response to a final action should be mailed to:

BOX AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C.20231

Or faxed to:

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to 4th Floor Receptionist, Crystal Park II,

2021 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA 22202.

Adnan Mirza

Examiner

JACK B. HARVEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER